

Application No.: 10/691182
Docket No.: FL0210USCIP

Page 3

REMARKS35 USC 102:

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Blair (US Pat. No 5,700,889). The Examiner has invited Applicant to explain how applying TFE/HFP differs from copolymerizing.

Blair discloses "copolymerizing tetrafluoroethylene with hexafluoropropylene... to obtain a partially-crystalline copolymer of tetrafluoroethylene with hexafluoropropylene" as seen at column 2 lines 14-19. The cited portions of Blair go into detail on a method of copolymerizing tetrafluoroethylene with hexafluoropropylene to make the copolymer, sometimes referred to as TFE/HFP copolymer.

Applicant's invention does not deal with polymerization of tetrafluoroethylene with hexafluoropropylene to make TFE/HFP copolymer, but with a "process for stabilizing melt-processible fluoropolymers" (p. 3, lines 22-23). TFE/HFP copolymer is a member of the class of melt-processible fluoropolymers (p. 15, lines 33-37). Thus, the present invention is concerned with processing TFE/HFP copolymer and not with the making of TFE/HFP copolymer (polymerization of tetrafluoroethylene with hexafluoropropylene). (It is noted that there are other methods of copolymerizing TFE/HFP than that disclosed by Blair.)

Claim 20, of the present invention, is directed to a process for applying TFE/HFP copolymer to a conductor. This application is not a polymerization process. This application begins with existing TFE/HFP copolymer. Example 11 describes the applying of TFE/HFP copolymer to a conductor by extrusion wire coating (p. 25, line 14). Example 11 cites U.S. Patent No. 5,703,185 (Example 10) as describing the extrusion coating. This Example 11 states clearly that the extrusion uses copolymer resin (col. 7, line 5). That is, polymerization plays no part in the application of the copolymer to the conductor.

Hence, Applicant contends that Blair and the present invention are comparing unlike processing. Blair discloses the copolymerization process to make a TFE/HFP copolymer. In contrast, Applicant's invention takes existing TFE/HFP copolymer and discloses applying extruded TFE/HFP copolymer onto a conductor.

Objected Claims:

The Examiner stated in the Office Action dated January 18, 2006, page 4, that Claim 21 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In Applicants' response filed May 16, 2006, claim 21 was so amended and thus, believed to be in allowable condition. In the present Office Action dated July 18,

Application No.: 10/691182
Docket No.: FL0210USCIP

Page 4

2006, the Examiner states the same objection to claim 21. Per a telephone conversation with Examiner Boykin on October 9, 2006, Examiner Boykin acknowledged that claim 21 is allowable subject matter and the repeat objection was in error. Thus, claim 21 as previously presented (May 16, 2006) is allowed.

A petition under 37 CFR § 1.136 is not believed required for consideration of this response. However, should any fee be required to obtain consideration of this response, please charge that fee time to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Fair

TAMERA L. FAIR
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 35,867
Telephone: (302) 892-7948
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: October 17, 2006